

GARMAN TURNER GORDON LLP  
 GERALD M. GORDON  
 Nevada Bar No. 229  
 E-mail: ggordon@gtg.legal  
 WILLIAM M. NOALL  
 Nevada Bar No. 3549  
 E-mail: wnoall@gtg.legal  
 GABRIELLE A. HAMM  
 Nevada Bar No. 11588  
 E-mail: ghamm@gtg.legal  
 7251 Amigo St., Suite 210  
 Las Vegas, Nevada 89119  
 Tel: (725) 777-3000 / Fax: (725) 777-3112

MICHAEL D. NAPOLI, ESQ.  
*Pro hac vice*  
 AKERMAN LLP  
 2001 Ross Avenue, Suite 3600  
 Dallas, Texas 75201  
 Tel: (214) 720-4360 / Fax: (214) 720-8116  
 Email: michael.napoli@akerman.com  
 ARIEL E. STERN, ESQ.  
 Nevada Bar No. 8276  
 AKERMAN LLP  
 1635 Village Center Circle, Suite 200  
 Las Vegas, Nevada 89134  
 Tel: (702) 634-5000 / Fax: (702) 380-8572  
 Email: ariel.stern@akerman.com

*Attorneys for Tecumseh-Infinity Medical  
 Receivable Fund, LP*

**IN THE UNITED STATES BANKRUPTCY COURT  
 FOR THE DISTRICT OF NEVADA**

In re:  
 INFINITY CAPITAL MANAGEMENT, INC.  
 Debtor.

Case No. 21-14486-abl

Chapter 7

HASELECT-MEDICAL RECEIVABLES  
 LITIGATION FINANCE FUND  
 INTERNATIONAL SP,

Adversary Case No. 21-01167-abl

Plaintiff,

**TECUMSEH-INFINITY MEDICAL  
 RECEIVABLES FUND, LP'S ANSWER  
 AND AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSES TO  
 TRUSTEE'S COUNTERCLAIM**

v.

TECUMSEH-INFINITY MEDICAL  
 RECEIVABLES FUND, LP,

Defendant/Counterclaim  
 Plaintiff,

v.

HASELECT-MEDICAL RECEIVABLES  
 LITIGATION FINANCE FUND  
 INTERNATIONAL SP, and ROBERT E.  
 ATKINSON, CHAPTER 7 TRUSTEE,

Counterclaim Defendants.

1 ROBERT E ATKINSON, CHAPTER 7  
2 TRUSTEE,

3 Counter Plaintiff,

4 v.

5 TECUMSEH-INFINITY MEDICAL  
6 RECEIVABLES FUND, LP,

7 Counter Defendant.

8 Defendant Tecumseh–Infinity Medical Receivables Fund LP (“Tecumseh” or “Counter  
9 Defendant”) submits its Answer and Affirmative Defenses to Counterclaim Plaintiff Robert E.  
10 Atkinson, Chapter 7 Trustee’s (“Trustee” or “Counter Plaintiff”) *Counterclaim against Tecumseh-  
11 Infinity Medical Receivables Fund, LP* (the “Counterclaim”) (ECF No. 32).

12 **ANSWER**

13 1. Paragraph 1 of the Counterclaim is a legal conclusion that does not require a  
14 response. To the extent a response is required, the allegations in paragraph 1 of the Counterclaim  
15 are denied.

16 2. Paragraph 2 of the Counterclaim is a legal conclusion that does not require a  
17 response. To the extent a response is required, the allegations in paragraph 2 of the Counterclaim  
18 are denied.

19 3. Paragraph 3 of the Counterclaim is a legal conclusion that does not require a  
20 response. To the extent a response is required, the allegations in paragraph 3 of the Counterclaim  
21 are denied.

22 4. Paragraph 4 of the Counterclaim is a legal conclusion that does not require a  
23 response. To the extent a response is required, the allegations in paragraph 4 of the Counterclaim  
24 are denied.

25 5. Tecumseh admits the allegations contained in paragraph 5 of the Counterclaim.

26 6. Tecumseh admits the allegations contained in paragraph 6 of the Counterclaim.

27 7. Tecumseh admits the allegations contained in paragraph 7 of the Counterclaim.

28 8. Tecumseh admits the allegations contained in paragraph 8 of the Counterclaim.

1           9.       Tecumseh denies the allegations contained in paragraph 9 of the Counterclaim.

2           10.       Tecumseh denies the allegations contained in paragraph 10 of the Counterclaim.

3           11.       Paragraph 11 of the Counterclaim is a legal conclusion that does not require a  
4 response. To the extent a response is required, the allegations in paragraph 11 of the Counterclaim  
5 are denied.

6           12.       The documents are not attached to the Counterclaim and otherwise speak for  
7 themselves. Tecumseh denies any remaining allegations set forth in paragraph 12 of the  
8 Counterclaim.

9           13.       The documents are not attached to the Counterclaim and otherwise speak for  
10 themselves. Tecumseh denies any remaining allegations set forth in paragraph 13 of the  
11 Counterclaim.

12           14.       The documents are not attached to the Counterclaim and otherwise speak for  
13 themselves. Tecumseh denies any remaining allegations set forth in paragraph 14 of the  
14 Counterclaim.

15           15.       The Sub-Advisory Agreement speaks for itself. Tecumseh denies any remaining  
16 allegations set forth in paragraph 14 of the Counterclaim.

17           16.       The documents are not attached to the Counterclaim and otherwise speak for  
18 themselves. Tecumseh denies any remaining allegations set forth in paragraph 16 of the  
19 Counterclaim.

20           17.       The documents are not attached to the Counterclaim and otherwise speak for  
21 themselves. Tecumseh denies any remaining allegations set forth in paragraph 17 of the  
22 Counterclaim.

23           18.       Tecumseh denies that the Debtor has the right to receive payment on any of the  
24 Tecumseh Receivables.<sup>1</sup> Tecumseh denies all remaining allegations set forth in paragraph 18 of  
25 the Counterclaim.

26

27

28

---

<sup>1</sup> Capitalized terms not otherwise defined herein will take on the meaning ascribed to them in Tecumseh's Counterclaim (ECF No. 26).

**FIRST CAUSE OF ACTION**

19. The responses set forth above are realleged and reaverred as if fully set forth herein.

20. Paragraph 20 of the Counterclaim is a legal conclusion that does not require a response. To the extent a response is required, the allegations in paragraph 20 of the Counterclaim are denied.

21. Paragraph 21 of the Counterclaim is a legal conclusion that does not require a response. To the extent a response is required, the allegations in paragraph 21 of the Counterclaim are denied.

22. Paragraph 22 of the Counterclaim is a legal conclusion that does not require a response. To the extent a response is required, the allegations in paragraph 22 of the Counterclaim are denied.

23. Paragraph 23 of the Counterclaim is a legal conclusion that does not require a response. To the extent a response is required, the allegations in paragraph 23 of the Counterclaim are denied.

24. Paragraph 24 of the Counterclaim is a legal conclusion that does not require a response. To the extent a response is required, the allegations in paragraph 24 of the Counterclaim are denied.

25. Paragraph 4 of the Counterclaim is a legal conclusion that does not require a response. To the extent a response is required, the allegations in paragraph 4 of the Counterclaim are denied.

26. Tecumseh denies the allegations contained in paragraph 26 of the Counterclaim.

27. Paragraph 27 of the Counterclaim is a legal conclusion that does not require a response. To the extent a response is required, the allegations in paragraph 27 of the Counterclaim are denied.

28. Paragraph 28 of the Counterclaim is a legal conclusion that does not require a response. To the extent a response is required, the allegations in paragraph 28 of the Counterclaim are denied.

29. Paragraph 29 of the Counterclaim is a legal conclusion that does not require a

1 response. To the extent a response is required, the allegations in paragraph 29 of the Counterclaim  
2 are denied.

3 30. Paragraph 30 of the Counterclaim is a legal conclusion that does not require a  
4 response. To the extent a response is required, the allegations in paragraph 30 of the Counterclaim  
5 are denied.

6 31. Paragraph 31 of the Counterclaim is a legal conclusion that does not require a  
7 response. To the extent a response is required, the allegations in paragraph 31 of the Counterclaim  
8 are denied.

9 32. Tecumseh denies that Trustee is entitled to any relief relating to the disputed  
10 receivables at issue, and expressly denies each and every assertion in the ‘wherefore’ clause found  
11 below Paragraph 32 of the Trustee’s Counterclaim.

12 33. Each and every allegation not specifically admitted herein is hereby denied.

### 13 **AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSES**

#### 14 **FIRST AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE**

15 The Court lacks subject matter jurisdiction over Tecumseh Receivables which are not  
16 property of the chapter 7 bankruptcy estate.

#### 17 **SECOND AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE**

18 The Tecumseh Receivables are not property of the Debtor’s estate and therefore are not  
19 subject to the Trustee’s strong-arm powers under 11 U.S.C. § 544(a).

#### 20 **THIRD AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE**

21 The Debtor possesses nothing more than bare legal title of Tecumseh Receivables as a  
22 purchase money resulting trust existed by operation of law pre-petition under South Carolina, by  
23 which Tecumseh Receivables were held in trust by Debtor for the benefit of Tecumseh, as provider  
24 of the purchase monies. The strong arm power of 11 U.S.C. § 544 “could not make the corpus of  
25 a valid resulting trust property of the bankruptcy debtor.” *In re Torrez*, 63 B.R. 751, 755 (B.A.P.  
26 9th Cir. 1986), *aff’d*, 827 F.2d 1299 (9th Cir. 1987) (“[u]nder California law a resulting trust is  
27 implied by operation of law whenever a party pays the purchase price for a parcel of land and  
28 places the title to that land in the name of another”); *see also Cage v. Kang (In re Kang)*, 2013

Bankr. LEXIS 844 (Bankr. S.D. Tex. Mar. 7, 2013) (resulting trust under Texas law prevails over section 544(a)(3)).

**FOURTH AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE**

Tecumseh was properly perfected prior to the Debtor's bankruptcy, and as such its interest in the Tecumseh Receivables may not be attacked under § 544(a).

Dated: January 28, 2022

Respectfully submitted,

GARMAN TURNER GORDON LLP

By: /s/ Gabrielle A. Hamm

Gerald M. Gordon, Esq.

William M. Noall, Esq.

Gabrielle A. Hamm, Esq.

7251 Amigo St., Suite 210

Las Vegas, Nevada 89119

and

MICHAEL D. NAPOLI, ESQ.

*Pro hac vice*

AKERMAN LLP

2001 Ross Avenue, Suite 3600

Dallas, Texas 75201

Tel: (214) 720-4360 / Fax: (214) 720-8116

ARIEL E. STERN, ESQ.

Nevada Bar No. 8276

AKERMAN LLP

1635 Village Center Circle, Suite 200

Las Vegas, Nevada 89134

Tel: (702) 634-5000 / Fax: (702) 380-8572

Email: ariel.stern@akerman.com

*Attorneys for Tecumseh-Infinity Medical  
Receivable Fund, LP*

4872-1853-1339, v. 1